

# The Times.

THE TIMES COMPANY.

**TIMES BUILDING,**  
TENTH AND BANK STREETS,  
RICHMOND, VA.  
THE DAILY TIMES is served by carriers on their own account in this city and Manchester for a cent a week, and outside of Richmond, by mail, for a year—anywhere in the United States.

Reading Notices, in reading-matter type, 25 cents per line. Carriage of advertising rates for space furnished on application. Remitt by draft, check, or money order, or by registered letter. Currency sent by mail is at the risk of the sender. The Times Building, 10th and Bank Streets, Richmond, Va. Telephone 251. Old Phone, 549. Editorial Rooms—New Phone, 81; Old Phone, 336. Specimen copies free.

All subscription by mail payable in advance. Watch the list on your paper, and if you live out of Richmond, and see when your subscription expires, or when you can renew before the paper is stopped.

The Times is always indebted to friends who favor it with letters and items, and must not forget that all such letters must be sent under the signature of the sender.

All unsolicited communications will be rejected unless accompanied by a return address.

**MANCHESTER, BUREAU, 112 HULL STREET.**

**PETERSBURG AGENT,**  
MRS. S. C. HUTCHINSON, 1 LOMBARD STREET.

THE MAILING LIST IS ONLY PRINTED ABOUT EVERY TEN DAYS. THEREFORE, DO NOT FEEL UNEASY IF THE LITTLE PINK SLIP IS NOT CHANGED AS SOON AS THE SUBSCRIPTION IS RENEWED.

WE DESIRE TO CALL THE ATTENTION OF ALL NEWS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS TO THE TIMES TO THE NECESSITY OF SUCH REPORTS. AS IT IS THE RULE OF THIS PAPER NOT TO PUBLISH ANY ARTICLE OF UNKNOWN OR UNRELIABLE AUTHORITY, WE REQUESTED CONTRIBUTIONS WILL NOT BE RETURNED UNLESS ACCOMPANIED BY STAMPS.

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1899.

## FRANCE'S SHAME.

The trial of Alfred Dreyfus and the finding of the court have brought French courts and French justice, so-called, into universal contempt. This man was convicted in the first instance upon forged testimony and after having been imprisoned for nearly five years upon a desolate island, a new trial was ordered, but this second trial was a farce such as has rarely been witnessed in the world's history. It deserves to go down the ages side by side with the famous trial of Haddell vs. Pickwick.

The proceedings before the court were more like the proceedings of a political convention than the dignified proceedings of an American court of justice. The guilt of Dreyfus was assumed from the start by the court which tried him, and this assumption was backed up by a great mass of opinion, but by no scientific evidence, as we understand the term in this country. The attitude of the court towards Dreyfus was that he was a guilty wretch by assumption and that it devolved upon him to establish his innocence, yet, marvelous to relate, those witnesses which were in a position to prove his innocence, were never introduced. No other conclusion, therefore, can be reached than that it was the determination of the court from the start, and regardless of evidence, to stamp guilt upon this man and blast his life.

This is a harsh saying, but it is the conclusion that is forced upon us, and we believe that it is the conclusion of every fair minded man who has followed the conduct of the trial. We do not pretend to say that Dreyfus is innocent. We do not pretend to know any more than others know who have read the testimony, but we do say deliberately that there was no proof whatever of his guilt as brought out in the trial, and in this country no prosecuting attorney would have had the effrontery to ask a verdict of guilty at the hands of an American jury upon the flimsy testimony, so-called, which was introduced by the prosecution.

It has been a most unfortunate affair for the French Republic. It has, we say, brought French courts and French justice into universal contempt, but that is not the end of it. We believe that the very foundation of the French Republic has been shaken so violently that dissolution is inevitable. It may not come in a day or in a year, but come it will, unless the Republic shall be saved by a miracle. The French Republic was on trial and it was found wanting.

## SOME ERRONEOUS IDEAS OF OUR CONSTITUTION.

The letter of Mr. J. S. Moore, supporting Mr. Bryan's idea of having the corporations licensed by the Federal Government, which we published yesterday, is one that should be replied to, because it contains most mischievous ideas put in a way to be very taking to misinformed readers. Accident prevented a reply at the time, but we make it now. Mr. Moore is wholly mistaken in thinking that the war made the United States a centralized government different in any respect whatever from what it had been before. The solitary thing settled by the war in this regard was that the States possessed no right to secede from the Union. No department of the Government claims any other result whatever for it. The Supreme Court of the United States administers the Constitution to-day exactly as it administered it prior to 1861, and neither the legislative nor the executive departments make any claim whatever for themselves in advance of the claims made by them in 1861. It is nowhere claimed that the war resulted in any change whatever in our fundamental law. It remains to-day exactly what it was in 1861, with the declaration produced by the war that no State can secede from the Union. That is a prime fact which it is all important every one should recognize and understand who proposes to deal with this subject.

It is true we added the three war amendments to the Constitution. The thirteenth and fifteenth deal with slavery and suffrage only, and may be laid aside for the present purpose. The fourteenth forbids the States to deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, but all men must regard that as one of the most beneficent provisions ever

made by the law-maker, and there can be no pretense that it changed the nature of our government in any way. That is the whole case so far as the war affected the structure of our National Government. A word now as to Mr. Moore's idea that because New York refuses to create a particular corporation, New Jersey may, and this corporation may then do business in New York in defiance of New York's laws. Mr. Moore thinks this is evidence that the whole frame and nature of our government are changed, but he takes a very superficial view of the case. New York may forbid a New Jersey corporation to do any business in New York if she will only forbid a New York corporation to do the same business. It is only when she seeks to abridge the natural freedom of citizens of the United States to do business all over this Union, and secure for her own citizens a monopoly of some valuable business that the Federal law intervenes and secures for the New Jersey corporation the same rights in New York that the New York corporation has there. Though it is very doubtful at last whether the Federal law will do this, it is quite possible that Mr. Moore has conjured up a danger that does not in fact exist.

If Mr. Moore will give greater attention to the subject he will find that the Constitution clothes Congress with full power to enact whatever laws are necessary for protecting agents and officers of the United States in every part of this Union while executing the laws of the United States or commanding obedience to its authority.

Our theory of government is the most blessed that ever came from the minds of men, and its corner-stone is the principle of local self-rule.

## ANOTHER VIEW OF INGERSOLL.

The best article that we have seen on Robert G. Ingersoll is contributed to the September number of the Bookman, by Harry Thurston Peck. He introduces his article by giving an interesting review of the circumstances under which Ingersoll came into prominence. He speaks of the political conditions existing in 1896 and of the dramatic interest of the national Republican convention of that year in which James G. Blaine was such a conspicuous figure. He refers to the eloquent speech which Mr. Ingersoll made in that convention in nominating Blaine, and of the prominence into which he was brought by that effort. "It was by this nominating speech," says Mr. Peck, "that he first became well known to the American people, and in the presidential campaign that fall, his services as a speaker on the stump materially added to his reputation. That is to say, it was as Ingersoll the political orator and not as Ingersoll the militant agnostic that men first learned to think of him." The deduction is that otherwise Ingersoll would never have gained the ear which he afterwards secured for his addresses on the subject of religion. It was his prominence as a political orator, under the peculiar circumstances which we have named, that made the people pay more attention to him when he began to discuss religious topics. We think that there is no doubt as to the correctness of this view.

With this introduction Mr. Peck proceeds to discuss Ingersoll, the agnostic. He eliminates the question of Ingersoll's private character as having nothing to do with the discussion. Nor is it worth while, he says, to take into consideration the soundness or the reasonableness of the views which he advocated. His opinions do not concern the student for they were mere opinions. Mr. Peck also dispenses with a passing remark the doctrine which Ingersoll taught, saying that his doubts and his unbelief are entitled to the same respect that we afford to the unshaken faith of other men. Indeed he goes a step farther and says that for the purpose of the moment it may be assumed that Ingersoll was right; that Christianity is merely a superstition and its history a fable. And so having brushed all these things out of the way he comes to the consideration of Ingersoll as a teacher. His first remark tallies with the opinion already expressed by The Times that Ingersoll was in no sense a thinker. "He had received a good professional training," says Mr. Peck, "he had read a considerable amount of standard literature, and he possessed the oratorical temperament with a liberal fund of wit and humor. But that was all. He had none of the scholar's thoroughness and the scholar's sobriety of thought. His controversial addresses, when stripped of all their rhetoric, their pungent phraseology and their often rather unsavory jokes, exhibit absolutely nothing that had not been advanced a hundred years before Ingersoll was born." In short he had a catchy way of addressing the public and possessed in a high degree the power of ridicule. He was lacking in reverence, and right here Mr. Peck makes this point against him. Ingersoll drew no distinction, he says, between political opinions and religious faith, but attacked the cherished faith of thousands with the free and easy manner that he showed in attacking what he regarded as political error.

We have said in discussing this subject that Christianity did not shrink from investigation, that it was not afraid of the truth, but we have always been at a loss to understand what good purpose Mr. Ingersoll had in view in trying to shake the faith of those who found comfort in Bible doctrine and who regulated their lives accordingly. True he found in the church some who did not live up to their profession, and it was all right for him to denounce hypocrites, but if he took the trouble to investigate he found thousands upon thousands who followed the precepts of the Bible, who lived good and righteous lives, who found comfort in their religion while they lived and in the hour of death the blessed assurance that their spirits were going to a better world. What good purpose Mr. Ingersoll expected to serve by destroying this faith and by taking out of the lives of millions of believers the comfort of religion and the hope of heaven is more than we can understand. Ingersoll himself said in one of his discourses: "Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind, and everything is wrong that increases the sum of human misery." By that same token religion is right because it does tend to the happiness of mankind, and it is not wrong because it does not increase the sum of human misery.

Yet Ingersoll not only attempted to deprive millions of this comfort and this hope, but made his attempt, as Mr. Peck points out, in the most brutal fashion. "If Col. Ingersoll honestly and conscientiously believed," says he, "that it was his duty to shake their faith, and to tear from them a belief that he supposed was a false one, then at the very least he should have respected the sincerity of their convictions and have laid his hand upon them gently and with reverence and not burst the sacred silence of their devotion with the belting of an itinerant stump-speaker and the clowning of a vulgar mountebank."

The next point that Mr. Peck makes against Mr. Ingersoll is that he tried to take away the Christian's hope without offering him anything whatever in exchange therefor. He argues that if death ends all, if the hope of immortality is a delusion, and if there is no richer, fuller and more glorious existence possible beyond the grave, then this life on earth is all that we have and our one concern must be to fill it full of happiness. To deprive the believer of his hope in heaven is to take the sweetness out of his life and consign him to despair; else you must tear his conscience and plunge him into a life of selfish indifference. "Grant if you will," adds Mr. Peck, "that the Christian's belief is a delusion, still it is not easy to explain why it is one's duty to destroy his faith and to rob him of his only source of consolation. Grant also that all the doctrines of revealed religion are without authority; yet who can fail to see that the life which they inculcate is the purest, noblest and most self-sacrificing life that man can live."

Comparisons are made every day of the year. Take the man who lives after the teachings of the Bible, who lives the simple, straightforward life which that great book declares to be the right way of living, and such a man will be healthier, happier, a better citizen, a better son, husband, father, a more beautiful character in every respect than he who puts the Bible out of his life and lives after the dictates of his own selfish nature. It was not shown by Colonel Ingersoll, and it cannot be shown by any of his followers, that man is worse for leading a consistent religious life. And so while we insist that religion courts investigation, and while we would not suppress the truth, we concur with the concluding remarks of Mr. Peck: "Let him who can not honestly believe hold to his doubt, or to his unbelief if he will; yet if he speaks one word to shake the faith of others then he assumes a terrible responsibility; for he is destroying that in place of which he can have absolutely nothing to bestow."

## THEORY, NOT PRINCIPLE.

Our esteemed contemporary, the Staunton Spectator, which has been in a better frame of mind since prosperity came, now talks of reconciliation between the two wings of the Democratic party, but thinks that those who advocate the gold standard are unreasonable in asking the Democratic party to abandon free silver. "In the first place," says the Spectator, "the gold faction, representing less than 13,000 votes, are demanding that we abandon principles for the sake of victory." No such demand has been made. We do not ask the Democratic party to abandon principle, but simply to abandon an exploded theory. The advocates of free silver contended in 1896 that prosperity could not be under the gold standard, and we summon the editor of the Spectator to give evidence to the fact that prosperity can be and is, under the gold standard, such prosperity as this country has rarely known. The free silver people made a great big mistake in 1896, and all that the gold Democrats ask is that they have the courage to stand up and acknowledge their error and then put it away with the errors of the past and adopt an old-fashioned Democratic platform.

There is nothing unreasonable in this. There is nothing in this proposition that any honest man need hesitate to accept.

Bad as this world is said to be, it treats some men more decently than they treat themselves.

If General Wheeler is not getting fight, ing enough to suit him out in the Philippines, he might come home and go into the Kentucky campaign.

## CURRENT COMMENT.

A special from Macon, Ga., says: "Ex-Congressman Jeff Long, of Macon, one of the ablest colored men in Georgia, is in receipt of a letter from Canton, O., asking him how many active white Republicans there are in Bibb county, and the scholar's sobriety of thought. His controversial addresses, when stripped of all their rhetoric, their pungent phraseology and their often rather unsavory jokes, exhibit absolutely nothing that had not been advanced a hundred years before Ingersoll was born." In short he had a catchy way of addressing the public and possessed in a high degree the power of ridicule. He was lacking in reverence, and right here Mr. Peck makes this point against him. Ingersoll drew no distinction, he says, between political opinions and religious faith, but attacked the cherished faith of thousands with the free and easy manner that he showed in attacking what he regarded as political error.

We have said in discussing this subject that Christianity did not shrink from investigation, that it was not afraid of the truth, but we have always been at a loss to understand what good purpose Mr. Ingersoll had in view in trying to shake the faith of those who found comfort in Bible doctrine and who regulated their lives accordingly. True he found in the church some who did not live up to their profession, and it was all right for him to denounce hypocrites, but if he took the trouble to investigate he found thousands upon thousands who followed the precepts of the Bible, who lived good and righteous lives, who found comfort in their religion while they lived and in the hour of death the blessed assurance that their spirits were going to a better world. What good purpose Mr. Ingersoll expected to serve by destroying this faith and by taking out of the lives of millions of believers the comfort of religion and the hope of heaven is more than we can understand. Ingersoll himself said in one of his discourses: "Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind, and everything is wrong that increases the sum of human misery." By that same token religion is right because it does tend to the happiness of mankind, and it is not wrong because it does not increase the sum of human misery.

Yet Ingersoll not only attempted to deprive millions of this comfort and this hope, but made his attempt, as Mr. Peck points out, in the most brutal fashion. "If Col. Ingersoll honestly and conscientiously believed," says he, "that it was his duty to shake their faith, and to tear from them a belief that he supposed was a false one, then at the very least he should have respected the sincerity of their convictions and have laid his hand upon them gently and with reverence and not burst the sacred silence of their devotion with the belting of an itinerant stump-speaker and the clowning of a vulgar mountebank."

The next point that Mr. Peck makes against Mr. Ingersoll is that he tried to take away the Christian's hope without offering him anything whatever in exchange therefor. He argues that if death ends all, if the hope of immortality is a delusion, and if there is no richer, fuller and more glorious existence possible beyond the grave, then this life on earth is all that we have and our one concern must be to fill it full of happiness. To deprive the believer of his hope in heaven is to take the sweetness out of his life and consign him to despair; else you must tear his conscience and plunge him into a life of selfish indifference. "Grant if you will," adds Mr. Peck, "that the Christian's belief is a delusion, still it is not easy to explain why it is one's duty to destroy his faith and to rob him of his only source of consolation. Grant also that all the doctrines of revealed religion are without authority; yet who can fail to see that the life which they inculcate is the purest, noblest and most self-sacrificing life that man can live."

Comparisons are made every day of the year. Take the man who lives after the teachings of the Bible, who lives the simple, straightforward life which that great book declares to be the right way of living, and such a man will be healthier, happier, a better citizen, a better son, husband, father, a more beautiful character in every respect than he who puts the Bible out of his life and lives after the dictates of his own selfish nature. It was not shown by Colonel Ingersoll, and it cannot be shown by any of his followers, that man is worse for leading a consistent religious life. And so while we insist that religion courts investigation, and while we would not suppress the truth, we concur with the concluding remarks of Mr. Peck: "Let him who can not honestly believe hold to his doubt, or to his unbelief if he will; yet if he speaks one word to shake the faith of others then he assumes a terrible responsibility; for he is destroying that in place of which he can have absolutely nothing to bestow."

THEORY, NOT PRINCIPLE.

Our esteemed contemporary, the Staunton Spectator, which has been in a better frame of mind since prosperity came, now talks of reconciliation between the two wings of the Democratic party, but thinks that those who advocate the gold standard are unreasonable in asking the Democratic party to abandon free silver. "In the first place," says the Spectator, "the gold faction, representing less than 13,000 votes, are demanding that we abandon principles for the sake of victory." No such demand has been made. We do not ask the Democratic party to abandon principle, but simply to abandon an exploded theory. The advocates of free silver contended in 1896 that prosperity could not be under the gold standard, and we summon the editor of the Spectator to give evidence to the fact that prosperity can be and is, under the gold standard, such prosperity as this country has rarely known. The free silver people made a great big mistake in 1896, and all that the gold Democrats ask is that they have the courage to stand up and acknowledge their error and then put it away with the errors of the past and adopt an old-fashioned Democratic platform.

There is nothing unreasonable in this. There is nothing in this proposition that any honest man need hesitate to accept.

Bad as this world is said to be, it treats some men more decently than they treat themselves.

If General Wheeler is not getting fighting enough to suit him out in the Philippines, he might come home and go into the Kentucky campaign.

## CURRENT COMMENT.

A special from Macon, Ga., says: "Ex-Congressman Jeff Long, of Macon, one of the ablest colored men in Georgia, is in receipt of a letter from Canton, O., asking him how many active white Republicans there are in Bibb county, and the scholar's sobriety of thought. His controversial addresses, when stripped of all their rhetoric, their pungent phraseology and their often rather unsavory jokes, exhibit absolutely nothing that had not been advanced a hundred years before Ingersoll was born." In short he had a catchy way of addressing the public and possessed in a high degree the power of ridicule. He was lacking in reverence, and right here Mr. Peck makes this point against him. Ingersoll drew no distinction, he says, between political opinions and religious faith, but attacked the cherished faith of thousands with the free and easy manner that he showed in attacking what he regarded as political error.

We have said in discussing this subject that Christianity did not shrink from investigation, that it was not afraid of the truth, but we have always been at a loss to understand what good purpose Mr. Ingersoll had in view in trying to shake the faith of those who found comfort in Bible doctrine and who regulated their lives accordingly. True he found in the church some who did not live up to their profession, and it was all right for him to denounce hypocrites, but if he took the trouble to investigate he found thousands upon thousands who followed the precepts of the Bible, who lived good and righteous lives, who found comfort in their religion while they lived and in the hour of death the blessed assurance that their spirits were going to a better world. What good purpose Mr. Ingersoll expected to serve by destroying this faith and by taking out of the lives of millions of believers the comfort of religion and the hope of heaven is more than we can understand. Ingersoll himself said in one of his discourses: "Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind, and everything is wrong that increases the sum of human misery." By that same token religion is right because it does tend to the happiness of mankind, and it is not wrong because it does not increase the sum of human misery.

Yet Ingersoll not only attempted to deprive millions of this comfort and this hope, but made his attempt, as Mr. Peck points out, in the most brutal fashion. "If Col. Ingersoll honestly and conscientiously believed," says he, "that it was his duty to shake their faith, and to tear from them a belief that he supposed was a false one, then at the very least he should have respected the sincerity of their convictions and have laid his hand upon them gently and with reverence and not burst the sacred silence of their devotion with the belting of an itinerant stump-speaker and the clowning of a vulgar mountebank."

The next point that Mr. Peck makes against Mr. Ingersoll is that he tried to take away the Christian's hope without offering him anything whatever in exchange therefor. He argues that if death ends all, if the hope of immortality is a delusion, and if there is no richer, fuller and more glorious existence possible beyond the grave, then this life on earth is all that we have and our one concern must be to fill it full of happiness. To deprive the believer of his hope in heaven is to take the sweetness out of his life and consign him to despair; else you must tear his conscience and plunge him into a life of selfish indifference. "Grant if you will," adds Mr. Peck, "that the Christian's belief is a delusion, still it is not easy to explain why it is one's duty to destroy his faith and to rob him of his only source of consolation. Grant also that all the doctrines of revealed religion are without authority; yet who can fail to see that the life which they inculcate is the purest, noblest and most self-sacrificing life that man can live."

Comparisons are made every day of the year. Take the man who lives after the teachings of the Bible, who lives the simple, straightforward life which that great book declares to be the right way of living, and such a man will be healthier, happier, a better citizen, a better son, husband, father, a more beautiful character in every respect than he who puts the Bible out of his life and lives after the dictates of his own selfish nature. It was not shown by Colonel Ingersoll, and it cannot be shown by any of his followers, that man is worse for leading a consistent religious life. And so while we insist that religion courts investigation, and while we would not suppress the truth, we concur with the concluding remarks of Mr. Peck: "Let him who can not honestly believe hold to his doubt, or to his unbelief if he will; yet if he speaks one word to shake the faith of others then he assumes a terrible responsibility; for he is destroying that in place of which he can have absolutely nothing to bestow."

THEORY, NOT PRINCIPLE.

Our esteemed contemporary, the Staunton Spectator, which has been in a better frame of mind since prosperity came, now talks of reconciliation between the two wings of the Democratic party, but thinks that those who advocate the gold standard are unreasonable in asking the Democratic party to abandon free silver. "In the first place," says the Spectator, "the gold faction, representing less than 13,000 votes, are demanding that we abandon principles for the sake of victory." No such demand has been made. We do not ask the Democratic party to abandon principle, but simply to abandon an exploded theory. The advocates of free silver contended in 1896 that prosperity could not be under the gold standard, and we summon the editor of the Spectator to give evidence to the fact that prosperity can be and is, under the gold standard, such prosperity as this country has rarely known. The free silver people made a great big mistake in 1896, and all that the gold Democrats ask is that they have the courage to stand up and acknowledge their error and then put it away with the errors of the past and adopt an old-fashioned Democratic platform.

There is nothing unreasonable in this. There is nothing in this proposition that any honest man need hesitate to accept.

Bad as this world is said to be, it treats some men more decently than they treat themselves.

If General Wheeler is not getting fighting enough to suit him out in the Philippines, he might come home and go into the Kentucky campaign.

## CURRENT COMMENT.

A special from Macon, Ga., says: "Ex-Congressman Jeff Long, of Macon, one of the ablest colored men in Georgia, is in receipt of a letter from Canton, O., asking him how many active white Republicans there are in Bibb county, and the scholar's sobriety of thought. His controversial addresses, when stripped of all their rhetoric, their pungent phraseology and their often rather unsavory jokes, exhibit absolutely nothing that had not been advanced a hundred years before Ingersoll was born." In short he had a catchy way of addressing the public and possessed in a high degree the power of ridicule. He was lacking in reverence, and right here Mr. Peck makes this point against him. Ingersoll drew no distinction, he says, between political opinions and religious faith, but attacked the cherished faith of thousands with the free and easy manner that he showed in attacking what he regarded as political error.

ously believed," says he, "that it was his duty to shake their faith, and to tear from them a belief that he supposed was a false one, then at the very least he should have respected the sincerity of their convictions and have laid his hand upon them gently and with reverence and not burst the sacred silence of their devotion with the belting of an itinerant stump-speaker and the clowning of a vulgar mountebank."

Mrs. E. A. Greer, a well-known Alabama lady, relative of the late Hon. Alexander Stephens, of Georgia, died at Opelika on the 6th instant.

Judge Estell, of Chattanooga, says that Rev. Sam Jones and George R. Stuart, the evangelists, who have been waging war against the liquor traffic in that city, are in contempt for the Circuit Court, the subpoenas issued for them being regular. The Judge has not yet decided as to what course he will pursue.

Charges have been filed with the Dispensary Board of South Carolina against Commissioner Douthett and Superintendent Bryant. Commissioner Douthett, according to the charges, has been giving away dispensary liquors and wines without accounting for the same. When orders were sent in by dispensers for Savannah, Atlanta and other beers, the commissioner substituted the product of a Macon brewery, the inference being that he was interested in that beer. Superintendent Bryant had been selling liquor contrary to law.

The board heard the excuses of the officers and dismissed the charges by administering a reprimand.

A special from Birmingham says that a cast iron pipe factory will be located in the Birmingham district in the near future by James Rowson, vice-president and treasurer of the Tennessee Coal and Iron Company, and J. R. P. Dimmock and others. Stock to the amount of \$127,000 has already been subscribed by the T. C. I. people.

## OUR RELIGIOUS CONTEMPORARIES.

Your quiet, self-possessed neighbor may be a saint, or he may be a claim who gets the credit for great self-control. There is a vast difference between cold blooded animal and animals whose blood has grown cold—Christian Advocate.

Our Catholics recognize to a greater extent, we believe, than do the members of any other denomination the principle of complete and absolute separation of Church and State. They are on the whole a conservative class who neither bring politics into religion nor religion into politics—Catholic Mirror.

The editors have many things to say, but they stand aside. The good news from the churches and associations must have the right of way. Editorials can wait—Religious Herald.

Jean Inglewold, dead now these four or five years, dead if Christians can die, was glad to think she was not bound to make the world go right. A large world to us, twenty-four or five thousand miles, which we had to walk, would take up much time. A small world as we compare it with other worlds, smaller still if compared with a universe of worlds. Yet on this small world the greatest of dramas were known. Here God made known His love to us, and here He sent for it. The world was not, not interested in this drama; some are to their joy and infinite hopes. This world, Jean Inglewold was not bound to make go right. Who is bound? God? It was Jean Inglewold, she also thought it was her duty to find out the work God gave her to do and do it cheerfully. Our work, do we know it, do we do it and cheerfully—Southern Churchman.

## AFTERMATH.

Mr. James R. Kurla, former ambassador to France, is extremely ill at Newport. It is given out from London that Baron de Buseh, of Freshwater, Hampshire, will marry Miss Pauline Joram, the American singer and violinist. The Baron is now thirty-nine years old.

The American Street Railway Convention will be held in Chicago October 17-20, and many topics of vital interest to street car men will be discussed.

As an evidence of the extreme hot weather out West a case of eggs shipped by express to St. Louis hatched out seven chickens in transit.

The New York papers have at last succeeded in locating Richard Croker. He was found in Milwaukee near Detroit, visiting his friend, Charles H. Engel, of Chicago, at his country home, where he has been since August 18.

The Louisville Evening Post claims to have found evidence which shows that in 1896 Goebel was in league with John G. Carlisle to knife J. S. C. Blackburn, who was then a free silver candidate for the United States Senate. The Post claims that at that time Goebel was then a cold blooded assassin. Blackburn is now giving Goebel his support.

A Distinction.

"I have one son in the army," said the precise mother, "and another under Otto in Manila."—Philadelphia North American.

His Business.

Ida—Who is that man we saw in front of the cat?

May—He takes tourists under ground.

Ida—Goodness! He must be an undertaker.—Chicago News.

He Knows.

"Pa, what's an old man's darling?"

"Oh, any one who will tell him he seems to be growing younger and younger every day."—Chicago Times Herald.

## Tutt's Pills Cure All Liver Ills.

ARE YOU BANKRUPT in health, constipation undermined by extravagance in eating, by disregarding the laws of nature, or physical capital all gone, if so, NEVER DESPAIR.

Tutt's Liver Pills will cure you. For sick headache, dyspepsia, sour stomach, malaria, torpid liver, constipation, biliousness and all kindred diseases.

Tutt's Liver Pills an absolute cure.

Returning Soldiers Greeted.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., Sept. 3.—The United States transport Sheridan was docked to-day and the Thirtieth Minnesota and the South Dakota Volunteers were landed. They were given a fine reception. The streets along the line of march to the Presidio were thronged with people, who cheered the soldiers with flowers. The men will go into camp at the Presidio and will be mustered out in a few weeks. The general health of the troops is good.

Money Stringency Feared.

NEW YORK, Sept. 9.—Frank A. Vanderlip, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, said today, and conferred informally with some of the representatives of the leading banking interests. He declared that his visit was without official significance, nevertheless admitting that the department recognized the possibility of a money stringency at this time, and said that it will do all in its power to assist in case of need.

## 3 DOLLAR SHOES



Hofheimer Bros Co

A WHOLE STORE DEVOTED TO ONE SPECIALTY.

\$3 ALL OVER THE HOUSE \$3 No More. No Less.

3 REASONS WHY: Because We fit the foot as nature intended. All sizes on hand. A to E.

Because We have all kinds of leather—Kid, Calf, Enamel, Box Calf, and Patent Leather, Tan Kid and Tan Willow Calf. A variety to choose from that equals \$5 ones.

Because We guarantee a saving of \$1 or more. The low price does not alter styles and quality.

But a wise man can readily see and understand. Our profit is in the volume of business.

Oh! We are selling more Men's Shoes from any other house in Richmond! Why? Because.

Shoes Shined Free. Opp. Chamber of Commerce.

## MET INSTANT DEATH.

Fate of an Engineer and His Fireman in South Carolina.

COLUMBIA, S. C., September 8.—The engine and several cars of a train loaded with granite went through the trestle of the Columbia, Newberry and Laurens road over Broad river, near this city, this afternoon. Engineer Weatherly, Fireman Rennie and two other men are known to have been killed. There may be others buried under the wreck. A car is supposed to have jumped the track and the jar caused the structure to give way.

There is no other way of accounting for the accident, as the trestle had just been overhauled by the bridge building force of the Atlantic Coast Line, and was yesterday turned over to President Childs with the report that it was in perfect condition.

An inspection showed the timbers to be new. Chief Engineer Ellis, of the road, said to-night that no trestling could stand the shaking that this was subjected to, and the fault lay with no one.

Two men fell over the side. Two of the men killed were young negroes who were stealing rides across the river.

While the trestle is being rebuilt the Columbia, Newberry and Laurens road will use the tracks of the Southern from Columbia to Columbia.

The engineer and fireman were carried down in their engine. The fall was so sudden that neither moved from his post and they met instant death.

Paul Kruger.

Deep mournful eyes that seek the ground. The devious path to trace. The giant form of Lincoln, crowned by Cromwell's graver face. Coarse, rustic garb, of unsmooth cut. That marks each mighty limb. Its shapely folds the ready butt Of Europe's jester trim.

So much the crowd can see; the rest Asks critics clearer-eyed; So rough a scabbard leaves unguessed How keen the blade must be. The trenchant will, the subtle brain, So wisely doctored to wage With destiny's still climbing hand. The hopeless war of age.

His kindred are a rugged brood. That curse a dying race. The sign of Calvin's bitter mood. And sterner than their sire. By faith through trackless deserts steered. Lost miles of lonely sand. Far from the intruding world they feared. They found their promised land.

By such grim guardians tutored well His Spartan childhood grew. The hand of the death-gazelle. The lion's path he knew. The camp surprised at dawn, the rush Of feet, the crackling smoke. When on the sleeping laager's hush The sudden Kalif broke.

Nay, once, 'tis said